

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending. Claim 10 has been canceled by this amendment. Claims 14-17 have been added.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 03(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter et al. (US Patent No. 6,789,077), in view of Wollrath et al (US Patent No. 6,253,256).

Slaughter is directed to searching of URL-addressable repositories. Wollrath is directed to managing reconstruction of objects until needed. The office action states, with regard to claim 1, the combination of references discloses, "at least on non-space specific double agent, operable to communication outside the community (Slaughter, figure 29, item 1250 and column 73, lines 34-36) by taking any objects from at least one Space in the community intended for a Space in another community and transferring them to the Space in another community (Wollrath, column 4, lines 47-59)."

However, Slaughter does not disclose a non-space specific double agent at 1250 in Figure 29. Item 1250 in Figure 9 is a client that is being brought into contact with a persistent store, not a double agent that is used to communicate outside of the store. Further, Wollrath does not have anything to do with spaces or persistent stores. Indeed, the only place Wollrath mentions spaces is with regard to address spaces, which are much different than persistent stores having publish and subscribe capabilities.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on

applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 -§ 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.

As Wollrath does not have anything to with spaces, where spaces are persistent stores, much less spaces that have a publish and subscribe capability, the combination of Wollrath with Slaughter is invalid. There is no motivation to combine these references, and therefore this combination is invalid.

As amended claim 1 is further clarified to show that the non-space specific double agent is to communicate outside the community with other persistent stores, which is not shown, taught or suggested by the combination of references. Further, neither reference, nor the combination thereof teaches a communications system having a community service for registering spaces.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-5 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 6, 11 and 13 have been amended to contain similar limitations as claim 1, including the addition of community service. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for the reasons as applied to claim 1.

Claims 7-10 depend from claim 6, and claim 12 depends from claim 13. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that 7-10, and

12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 14-17 are added by this amendment. The specification supports these claims in several places, among them pages 10-11, with regard to claims 14-15 and pages 6 and 7 with regard to claim 16. Claim 17 is similar to claim 13 in a different form.


Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613